arXiv:1606.02194v1 [math.OC] 7 Jun 2016

The Price of Anarchy in Transportation Networks by Estimating User Cost Functions from Actual Traffic Data *

Jing Zhang, Sepideh Pourazarm,† Christos G. Cassandras,
and Ioannis Ch. Paschalidis ‡

June 8, 2016

Abstract

We have considered a large-scale road network in Eastern Massachusetts. Using real traffic data in the form of spatial average speeds and the flow capacity for each road segment of the network, we converted the speed data to flow data and estimated the origin-destination flow demand matrices for the network. Assuming that the observed traffic data correspond to user (Wardrop) equilibria for different times-of-the-day and days-of-the-week, we formulated appropriate inverse problems to recover the per-road cost (congestion) functions determining user route selection for each month and time-of-day period. In addition, we analyzed the sensitivity of the total user latency cost to important parameters such as road capacities and minimum travel times. Finally, we formulated a system-optimum problem in order to find socially optimal flows for the network. We investigated the network performance, in terms of the total latency, under a user-optimal policy versus a system-optimal policy. The ratio of these two quantities is defined as the Price of Anarchy (POA) and quantifies the efficiency loss of selfish actions compared to socially optimal ones. Our findings contribute to efforts for a smarter and more efficient city.

1 Introduction

A transportation (traffic) network is a system with non-cooperative agents (drivers) in which each driver seeks to minimize her own cost by choosing the best route (resources) to reach her destination without taking into account the overall system performance. In these systems, the cost for each agent depends on the resources it chooses as well as the number of agents choosing the same resources [1]. In such a non-cooperative setting, one often observes convergence to a Nash equilibrium, a point where no agent can benefit by altering its actions assuming that the actions of all the other agents remain fixed [2]. However, it is known that the Nash equilibrium is not always the best strategy from the system's point of view and results in a suboptimal behavior compared to the *socially optimal* policy. In a transportation network with selfish drivers, each agent (driver) follows the path (we will use "path" and "route" interchangeably) derived from a *user optimal* policy. In order to quantify the social suboptimality of selfish driving, we use the Price of Anarchy (POA) as a measure to compare system performance under a user-optimal policy vs. a system-optimal policy.

The equilibrium flow in traffic networks, known as "Wardrop equilibrium," is the solution of the *Traffic Assignment Problem (TAP)* [3, 4]. In the transportation science literature, the TAP, which will be termed "forward problem" in what follows, has been extensively explored; see, e.g., [4] and the references therein. To solve the TAP, we need to know *a priori* the specific cost function, as well as the Origin-Destination (O-D) demand matrix.

Recent developments in data-driven inverse optimization techniques [5] enable the estimation of the cost (usually, the travel time) functions given the observations of the equilibrium flows from a large-scale transportation network. This facilitates a better understanding of the underlying dynamics of the transportation system itself. In addition,

*Submitted to the 2016 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control. Research partially supported by the NSF under grants CNS-1239021, ECCS-1509084, CCF-1527292, IIS-1237022, and IIP-1430145, by the AFOSR under grant FA9550-15-1-0471, by the ARO under grants W911NF-11-1-0227 and W911NF-12-1-0390, by ONR under grant N00014-09-1-1051 and by the Cyprus Research Promotion Foundation under Grant New Infrastructure Project/Strategic/0308/26.

† Division of Systems Eng., Boston University, e-mail: {jzh, sepid}@bu.edu.

‡Department of Electrical and Computer Eng. and Division of Systems Eng., Boston University, 8 St. Mary's St., Boston, MA 02215, e-mail: {cgc, yannisp}@bu.edu.

with cost function estimates at our disposal, we can address the issue of improving a traffic network's performance by controlling traffic flows, hence, hopefully contributing to the design of better transportation systems that serve Smart Cities. More specifically, the techniques we develop enable sensitivity analysis with respect to several key parameters of the road network, which, in turn, could help prioritize specific interventions that can alleviate congestion at key parts of the network.

In this paper, we leverage actual traffic data provided to us by the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Applying a traffic flow model, we first infer equilibrium flows on each segment from the spatial average speed data. Then, by adopting the estimated traffic flows we obtain O-D demand matrices which pave the way to the derivation of cost function estimators by solving a set of inverse variational inequality problems. In an effort to prioritize roads for congestion mitigating interventions, we perform sensitivity analysis of the total users' cost with respect to parameters of interest. Finally, we formulate a system-centric problem in which agents, here drivers, cooperate to optimize the overall system performance. This allows us to estimate the POA for a sub-network so as to determine the difference in network performance between selfish routing (non-cooperative) and system-optimal routing (cooperative).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we present the models and methods we apply to the traffic data. In Sec. 3 we provide descriptions of the datasets we use. We elaborate on data processing tasks in Sec. 4 and show our findings for the cost function estimators and sensitivity analysis in Sec. 5. We quantify the POA for the transportation network in Sec. 6, where numerical results for a subnetwork are included to illustrate our approaches. We conclude in Sec. 7.

Notational conventions: All vectors are column vectors. For economy of space, we write $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ to denote the column vector $\mathbf{x}$. We use "prime" to denote the transpose of a matrix or vector. Unless otherwise specified, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the ℓ_2 norm. $|\mathscr{D}|$ denotes the cardinality of a set $\mathscr{D}$. $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B$ indicates A is defined using B. $\mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the set of all nonnegative real numbers.

2 Models and Methods

We first describe the model for single-class transportation networks, which we adopt throughout the paper. We then provide two equivalent formulations for the forward problem and, based on the latter formulation, we derive sensitivity analysis results. Finally we provide a formulation for the inverse problem which will play a key role in estimating the cost functions.

2.1 Model for single-class transportation network

Consider a directed graph, denoted by $(\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{A})$, where $\mathscr{V}$ denotes the set of nodes and $\mathscr{A}$ the set of links. Assume it is strongly connected. Let $\mathbf{N} \in \{0, 1, -1\}^{|\mathscr{V}| \times |\mathscr{A}|}$ be the node-link incidence matrix, and $\mathbf{e}_a$ the vector with an entry equal to 1 corresponding to link a and all the other entries equal to 0.

Let $\mathbf{w} = (w_s, w_t)$ denote an origin-destination (O-D) pair and

$$\mathscr{W} = \{\mathbf{w}_i : \mathbf{w}_i = (w_{si}, w_{ti}), i = 1, \ldots, |\mathscr{W}|\}$$

the set of all O-D pairs. Denote by $d^{\mathbf{w}} \geq 0$ the amount of the flow demand from w_s to w_t. Let $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathscr{V}|}$ be the vector which is all zeros, except for a $d^{\mathbf{w}}$ in the coordinate corresponding to node w_s and a $-d^{\mathbf{w}}$ in the coordinate corresponding to node w_t.

Let x_a be the total link flow on link $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\mathbf{x}$ the vector of these flows. Let $t_a(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathscr{A}|} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the cost function for link $a \in \mathscr{A}$; in particular, when $t_a(\mathbf{x})$ only depends on x_a, we also write $t_a(\mathbf{x})$ as $t_a(x_a)$. In addition, denote by $\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})$ the vector-valued function whose ath component is $t_a(\mathbf{x})$.

Let $\mathscr{R}_{pq}$ be the index set of simple routes (a *simple route* is a route without cycles) connecting the O-D pair $(p,q) \in \mathscr{W}$. For all $a \in \mathscr{A}$, $r \in \mathscr{R}_{pq}$, and $(p,q) \in \mathscr{W}$, define the link-route incidence by

$$\delta_{ra}^{pq} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if route } r \in \mathscr{R}_{pq} \text{ uses link } a, \\ 0, \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathscr{F}$ be the set of feasible flow vectors defined by

$$\left\{ \mathbf{x} : \exists \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{|\mathscr{A}|} \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x} = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathscr{W}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}},\ \mathbf{N}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}},\ \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathscr{W} \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{w}}$ is the flow vector attributed to O-D pair $\mathbf{w}$. As a stepping stone for formulating the problems of interest, we present next the definition of Wardrop equilibrium.

Definition 1 *([5]).* A feasible flow $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathscr{F}$ is a *Wardrop equilibrium* if for every O-D pair $\mathbf{w} \in \mathscr{W}$, and any route connecting (w_s, w_t) with positive flow in $\mathbf{x}^*$, the cost of traveling along that route is less than or equal to the cost of traveling along any other route that connects (w_s, w_t). Here, the cost of traveling along a route is the sum of the costs of each of its constituent links.

2.2 The forward problem

In this work, the forward problem (i.e., the TAP) refers to finding the Wardrop equilibrium for a given single-class transportation network with a given O-D demand matrix. We first formulate the TAP as a Variational Inequalities (VI) problem (see Def. 2 below), and then present an optimization problem as an alternative.

Definition 2 *([5]).* The VI problem, denoted VI$(\mathbf{t}, \mathscr{F})$, is to find an $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathscr{F}$ s.t.

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}^*)'(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{F}. \tag{1}$$

We need the following assumption for the theorem that follows.

Assumption 1 *([4, 5]).* $\mathbf{t}(\cdot)$ is strongly monotone (see [4] or [5] for the definition of strong monotonicity) and continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{|\mathscr{A}|}$. $\mathscr{F}$ is nonempty and contains an interior point (Slater's condition).

Theorem 2.1 *([4, 5]). Suppose Assump. 1 holds. Then, there exists a Wardrop equilibrium of the single-class transportation network, which is the unique solution to VI$(\boldsymbol{t}, \mathscr{F})$.*

Proof: This can be established by applying [4, Thms. 3.14, 3.17, and 3.19]. Recall that, in the single-class transportation network model, we assume the network to be strongly connected and the demand for each O-D pair to be fixed (given) and nonnegative. In addition, having assumed the additivity for the route costs in the definition of the Wardrop equilibrium (Def. 1), we see that, under Assump. 1, [4, Assump. 3.A], which yields [4, Thm. 3.14], [4, Assump. 3.C], which in turn yields [4, Thm. 3.17], and [4, Assump. 3.D], which implies [4, Thm. 3.19], are all satisfied. ■

Now we present an equivalent formulation of the forward problem. It is a well-known fact that the TAP can also be formulated as the following optimization problem [3, 4]:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{F}} \sum_{a \in \mathscr{A}} \int_0^{x_a} t_a(s)\, ds. \tag{2}$$

Note that here the objective function is different from the one we will use in the formulation for finding the social optimum (see Sec. 6); for a detailed explanation, see [3].

2.3 Sensitivity analysis

Throughout the paper, we assume that the cost functions have the following form [5, 6]:

$$t_a(x_a) = t_a^0 g\left(\frac{x_a}{m_a}\right), \tag{3}$$

where t_a^0 is the free-flow travel time of $a \in \mathscr{A}$, $g(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing and continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_+$, and m_a is the effective flow capacity of $a \in \mathscr{A}$.

Write $\mathbf{t}^0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} (t_a^0;\, a \in \mathscr{A})$, $\mathbf{m} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (m_a;\, a \in \mathscr{A})$, and

$$V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{F}} \sum_{a \in \mathscr{A}} \int_0^{x_a} t_a^0 g\left(\frac{s}{m_a}\right) ds. \tag{4}$$

Let $\mathbf{x}^* \overset{\text{def}}{=} (x_a^*; a \in \mathscr{A})$ denote the solution to (2). Using [7, Thm. 19.5], we obtain

$$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m})}{\partial t_a^0} = \int_0^{x_a^*} g\left(\frac{s}{m_a}\right) ds, \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m})}{\partial m_a} = \int_0^{x_a^*} t_a^0 \dot{g}\left(\frac{s}{m_a}\right)\left(-\frac{s}{m_a^2}\right) ds, \tag{6}$$

where $\dot{g}(\cdot)$ denotes the derivative of $g(\cdot)$.

2.4 Inverse VI problem formulation

Now, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we present the definition of an *ε-approximate solution* to VI$(\mathbf{t}, \mathscr{F})$ by replacing the right-hand side of (1) with $-\varepsilon$:

Definition 3 *([5])*. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathscr{F}$ is said to be an *ε-approximate solution* to VI$(\mathbf{t}, \mathscr{F})$ if

$$\mathbf{t}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})'(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \geq -\varepsilon, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{F}. \tag{7}$$

Assume we are given observations $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathscr{F}_k)$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, with $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathscr{F}_k$ and each $\mathscr{F}_k$ being a set of feasible flow vectors satisfying Slater's condition accordingly. The inverse VI problem amounts to seeking a function $\mathbf{t}$ such that $\mathbf{x}_k$ is an ε_k-approximate solution to VI$(\mathbf{t}, \mathscr{F}_k)$ for each k. Therefore, we can formulate the inverse VI problem as [5]

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_k)'(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_k) \geq -\varepsilon_k, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{F}_k, \ \forall k. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We now apply the nonparametric estimation approach of [5] which expresses the congestion function in a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS) [8]. In particular, we use the polynomial kernel, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\phi}(x, y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (c + xy)^d$ for some choice of $c \geq 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Take the costs as in (3). Assume we are given networks $(\mathscr{V}_k, \mathscr{A}_k, \mathscr{W}_k)$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, and the link flow data $\{\mathbf{x}^k = (x_a^k; a \in \mathscr{A}_k); k = 1, \ldots, K\}$ are available. Let $M = \sum_{k=1}^K |\mathscr{A}_k|$ and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_M) \overset{\text{def}}{=} ((\mathbf{x}^1)', \ldots, (\mathbf{x}^K)')$. Define the kernel matrix as $\boldsymbol{\Phi} = [\boldsymbol{\phi}(z_i, z_j)]_{i,j=1}^M$. Then, using conic duality, by [5, Thm. 2], we reformulate the inverse VI problem (8) as the following Quadratic Programming (QP) problem [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \ & \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \gamma \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\| \\ \text{s.t.} \ & \mathbf{e}_a' \mathbf{N}_k' \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{w}} \leq t_a^0 \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathbf{e}_a, \ \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathscr{W}_k, \ a \in \mathscr{A}_k, \ k = 1, \ldots, K, \\ & \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathbf{e}_a \leq \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathbf{e}_{\tilde{a}}, \ \forall a, \tilde{a} \in \mathscr{A}_0 \ \text{ s.t. } \frac{x_a}{m_a} \leq \frac{x_{\tilde{a}}}{m_{\tilde{a}}}, \\ & \sum_{a \in \mathscr{A}_k} t_a^0 x_a \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathbf{e}_a - \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathscr{W}_k} (\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}})' \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{w}} \leq \varepsilon_k, \ \forall k = 1, \ldots, K, \\ & \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathbf{e}_{a_0} = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is a decision vector, γ is a regularization parameter, $\mathscr{A}_0 \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathscr{A}_k$, and a_0 is some (arbitrary) link chosen for normalization purposes. The second constraint in (9) forces the function $g(\cdot)$ to be non-decreasing on the links in $\mathscr{A}_0$.

We can derive an estimator of the cost function $g(\cdot)$ by solving the QP (9), thereby, obtaining an optimal $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$. In particular, if writing $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* = (\alpha_1^*, \ldots, \alpha_M^*)$, then, by [5, Thm. 4], we obtain

$$g(\cdot) = \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m^* \boldsymbol{\phi}(z_m, \cdot). \tag{10}$$

3 Data Set Description

3.1 Speed dataset description

The actual traffic data provided by the MPO is a dataset of 51.2 GB consisting of 861 CSV files, each with more than 1 million lines of data. The dataset includes the spatial average speeds for major roadways and arterial streets in

Eastern Massachusetts for the year 2012. The average speed within a given unit of spatial reference is calculated by aggregating observed speeds from billions of data points. Specifically, it is derived by combining data from physical traffic sensors (e.g., induction loop sensors, toll tag readers, etc), as well as all available data from probe vehicles (equipped with on-board GPS devices returning speed and location back to a central system) that fall within a specific segment of a road for a particular time window.

The dataset includes traffic data for more than 13,000 road segments (with the average distance of 0.7 miles; see Fig. 1) of Eastern Massachusetts, covering the average speed for every minute of the year 2012.



Figure 1: All available road segments in the road map of Eastern Massachusetts.

For each road segment, identified with a unique *tmc (traffic message channel)* code, the dataset provides information such as speed data (instantaneous, average and free-flow speed) in mph, date and time, and traveling time (minute) through that segment. Note that a road typically consists of many segments.



(a) (b)

Figure 2: (a) An interstate highway sub-network of Eastern Massachusetts (a sub-map of Fig. 1; the blue numbers indicate node indices); (b) The topology of the sub-network (the numbers beside arrows are link indices, and the numbers inside ellipses are node indices).

3.2 Capacity dataset description

The flow capacity (vehicles/hour) dataset, provided by the MPO, includes capacity data – vehicle counts for each road segment – for more than 100,000 road segments (average distance of 0.13 miles) in Eastern Massachusetts. In particular, the capacity data is given for four different time periods (AM: 6 am – 9 am, MD: 9 am – 3 pm, PM: 3 pm – 6 pm, and NT: 6 pm – 6 am) in a day. For each time period, the total roadway capacity for all available lanes for that time period is given. These values are calculated based on the share of daily traffic counts in each hour of that time period. For each time period there exists a period capacity factor applied to represent peak hour conditions within that period. These factors are as follows: 2.5 for AM, 4.75 for MD, 2.5 for PM, and 7 for NT. Then, the total roadway capacity for a time period is the product of the capacity/lane/hour, the number of lanes, and the capacity factor. In our experiments, we need flow capacity on each segment in vehicle counts per hour. Thus, for each time period we scale the given vehicle counts by the inverse of the corresponding capacity factor.

3.3 Matching capacity data with speed data

Note that, in the capacity dataset, the ID for a road segment is named *road inventory ID*, and the segments are not absolutely identical with those in the speed dataset. Based on the geographic longitude and latitude, we have built up a dictionary mapping segments with *tmc* code to capacity dataset *road inventory ID*, through which we can read the capacity data for each road segment in the speed dataset.

4 Data Processing

4.1 Preprocessing

4.1.1 Calculating average speed and free-flow speed

First, we select the time instances set $\mathscr{T}$ consisting of each minute of AM (7 am – 9 am), MD (11 am – 1 pm), PM (5 pm – 7 pm), and NT (9 pm – 11 pm) for each day of January, April, July, and October, all in 2012. Note that the selected AM (resp., MD, PM, NT) period is a subinterval of the AM (resp., MD, PM, NT) period in the capacity dataset. Then, we calculate the average speed for each segment separately for the four time periods, each of which lasts 120 minutes. Finally, for each segment, we compute a reliable proxy of the free-flow speed by using the 85th-percentile point of the observed speeds on that segment for all the time instances belonging to $\mathscr{T}$.

4.1.2 Selecting a sub-network

To reduce the computational burden while capturing the key elements of the Eastern Massachusetts road network, we only consider a representative interstate highway sub-network as shown in Fig. 2(a), where there are 701 road segments, composing a road network with 8 nodes and 24 links. We depict the topology of this sub-network in Fig. 2(b).

4.1.3 Aggregating flows of the segments on each link

Let $\{v_a^j, t_a^j, v_a^{0j}, t_a^{0j}, m_a^j;\ j = 1,\ldots,J_a\}$ denote the available observations (v_a^j, t_a^j), and parameters (v_a^{0j}, t_a^{0j}, m_a^j) of the segments composing link $a \in \mathscr{A}$, where, for each segment j, v_a^j (resp., v_a^{0j}) is the speed (resp., free-flow speed; miles/hour), t_a^j (resp., t_a^{0j}) is the travel time (resp., free-flow travel time; hour), and m_a^j is the flow capacity (vehicles/hour). Then, using Greenshield's model [9], we calculate the flow on segment j by

$$x_a^j = \frac{4m_a^j}{v_a^{0j}} v_a^j - \frac{4m_a^j}{(v_a^{0j})^2} (v_a^j)^2. \tag{11}$$

In our analysis, we enforce $v_a^j \le v_a^{0j}$ to make sure that the flow given by (11) is nonnegative. In particular, if for some time instance $v_a^j > v_a^{0j}$ (this rarely happens), we set $v_a^j = v_a^{0j}$ in (11), thus leading to a zero flow estimation for this time instance.



(a) Jan. (b) Apr.

(c) Jul. (d) Oct.

Figure 3: Comparison of the estimated cost functions corresponding to different time periods.

Aggregating over all segments composing link a we compute:

$$x_a = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_a} x_a^j t_a^j}{\sum_{j=1}^{J_a} t_a^j}, \;\; t_a^0 = \sum_{j=1}^{J_a} t_a^{0j}, \;\; m_a = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_a} m_a^j t_a^{0j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{J_a} t_a^{0j}},$$

where x_a^j is given by (11) and $t_a^{0j} = v_a^j t_a^j / v_a^{0j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, J_a$.

4.1.4 Processing flow data such that the flow conservation law is satisfied

For $a \in \mathscr{A}$, let $\hat{x}_a$ denote the original estimate of the flow on link a, and x_a its adjustment. Solve the following *Least Squares Problem (LSP)*:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}} \quad & \sum_{a \in \mathscr{A}} (x_a - \hat{x}_a)^2 && (12) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{a \in I(i)} x_a = \sum_{a \in O(i)} x_a, && \forall i \in \mathscr{V}, \\ & x_a \geq 0, && \forall a \in \mathscr{A}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first constraint enforces flow conservation for each node $i \in \mathscr{V}$, where $I(i)$ (resp., $O(i)$) denotes the set of links entering (resp., outgoing) to (resp., from) node i.

Remark: Strictly speaking, we should replace the non-negativity constraint in (12) with $0 \leq x_a \leq m_a$, $a \in \mathscr{A}$ where m_a denotes the flow capacity of link a. However, we know that the latter is not a "hard" constraint [5], and the solution to the LSP is actually very close to the initial estimates of the link flows, which satisfy the flow capacity constraint, so we only consider $x_a \geq 0$ in (12).

Table 1: Scaled sensitivity analysis results.

$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0,\mathbf{m})}{\partial t_a^0}$				$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0,\mathbf{m})}{\partial m_a}$			
(0, 0.226)	(1, 0.177)	(2, 0.26)	(3, 0.208)	(0, -0.009)	(1, -0.005)	(2, -0.011)	(3, -0.005)
(4, 0.54)	(5, 0.198)	(6, 0.199)	(7, 0.242)	(4, -0.036)	(5, -0.002)	(6, -0.009)	(7, -0.017)
(8, 0.924)	(9, 0.327)	(10, 0.951)	(11, 0.543)	(8, -0.496)	(9, -0.009)	(10, -0.605)	(11, -0.094)
(12, 0.389)	(13, 0.245)	(14, 0.539)	(15, 0.42)	(12, -0.048)	(13, -0.007)	(14, -0.119)	(15, -0.103)
(16, 0.178)	(17, 0.129)	(18, 0.341)	(19, 1.0)	(16, -0.004)	(17, -0.002)	(18, -0.011)	(19, -0.883)
(20, 0.892)	(21, 0.838)	(22, 0.234)	(23, 0.833)	(20, -0.888)	(21, -0.776)	(22, -0.006)	(23, -1.0)

4.2 Estimating the O-D demand matrix

Note that we need to know the O-D demand information (compiled into a matrix) in both the forward problem formulation (2) and the inverse problem formulation (9). Based on the parameters and flows of the road network, we borrow the General Least Squares (GLS) method [10] to estimate the desired O-D demand matrix, using the following steps:

4.2.1 Obtaining link-route incidence matrix

We assume that each node could be an origin and a destination; for the subnetwork shown in Fig. 2(a), there are $8 \times (8-1) = 56$ O-D pairs in total. We then identify feasible routes for each O-D pair, thereby obtaining a 24×140 link-route incidence matrix (recall the definition of link-route incidence in Sec. 2; 140 routes identified in total); for details, see [11, 12].

4.2.2 Estimating route choice probability matrix

We estimate the route choice probability matrix using a logit choice model [10], so that

$$p_{ir} = \frac{\exp(-\theta h_{ir})}{\sum_{s \in \mathscr{R}_i} \exp(-\theta h_{is})},$$

where p_{ir} is the probability that a traveler between O-D pair i uses feasible route r, $\theta = 0.5$ is the logit choice parameter, h_{ir} denotes the length of route r, and $\mathscr{R}_i$ is the set of feasible routes between O-D pair i.

4.2.3 Implementing GLS method

We implement the GLS method [10] to estimate the O-D demand matrix (vectorized as a 56-dimensional vector denoted by $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$), which reduces to a least-squares estimation problem.

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be the link-route incidence matrix obtained in Sec. 4.2.1 and $\mathbf{P} = [p_{ir}]$ the route choice probability matrix derived in Sec. 4.2.2. Let $\{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; k = 1, \ldots, K\}$ denote the K observations of the flow vector and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ the average. Then, the O-D demand matrix estimation is equivalent to the following QP [10]:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}'\boldsymbol{\lambda}\right)' \mathbf{S}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}'\boldsymbol{\lambda}\right), \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{S} = (1/(K-1)) \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\right)'$ is the sample covariance matrix.

By expanding the right-hand side of the objective, we see that the QP (13) reduces to

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq \mathbf{0}} \quad \frac{K}{2} \boldsymbol{\lambda}' \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\lambda} - \mathbf{b}' \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \tag{14}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$.

We solve the QP (14) using data corresponding to five different time periods (AM, MD, PM, NT, and weekend) of four months (Jan., Apr., Jul., and Oct.) in 2012, thus obtaining 20 different O-D demand matrices for these scenarios; for details, see [13].

4.3 Estimating cost functions

Using the estimated flow data and the O-D demand matrices, we then estimate the costs for 20 different scenarios by solving the QP (9) accordingly. We use polynomial kernels $\mathbf{\Phi}$ and obtain the estimated cost functions $g(\cdot)$ as polynomial functions. To make the estimated costs reliable, for each scenario, we perform a 3-fold cross-validation; for details, see [14].

4.4 Analyzing parameter sensitivities

Having obtained the costs $g(\cdot)$, we then can perform the sensitivity analysis, via (5) and (6). The results could vary for different time periods, and we take as a representative scenario the PM peak period on January 10, 2012.

5 Numerical Results

5.1 Comparison of estimates for the cost functions

We list the comparison results of the estimated costs in Fig. 3, where in each sub-figure, we plot the curves of the estimated $g(\cdot)$ corresponding to five different time periods.

We observe from Figs. 3(a) – 3(d) that the costs for the AM/PM peaks are much more sensitive to traffic flows than for the other three time periods (MD, NT, and weekend). This can be explained as follows: during AM/PM peaks, it is very common for vehicles to pass through a congested road network while during MD, NT, or weekend periods, drivers mostly enjoy an uncongested road network.

In addition, it is seen that, for January and October, the cost curves for AM peak and PM peak are very close, while for April and July, these are not at the same level of accuracy. Aside from the observation and modeling errors, this can also be explained by seasonal traveling patterns.

5.2 Sensitivity analysis results

The sensitivity analysis results corresponding to the PM peak period on January 10, 2012 are shown in Tab. 1, where each entry is a 2-tuple with the first element being the link index and the second element being the scaled partial derivative value. For instance, the entry $(0, 0.226)$ means

$$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m})}{\partial t_a^0} = 0.226 \times \max\left\{ \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m})}{\partial t_a^0}; a = 0, \ldots, 23 \right\}$$

for link 0.

It is seen that the largest five values of $\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m})/\partial t_a^0$ correspond to links 19, 10, 8, 20, and 21 (red numbers on the left), and the largest five absolute values of $\partial V(\mathbf{t}^0, \mathbf{m})/\partial m_a$ correspond to links 23, 20, 19, 21, and 10 (blue numbers on the right). This suggests that, around the PM peak period of January 10, 2012, the transportation management department could have most efficiently reduced the total users' travel time by taking actions with priorities on these links (e.g., improving road conditions to reduce the free-flow travel time for links 19, 10, 8, 20, and 21, and increasing the number of lanes to enlarge the flow capacity for links 23, 20, 19, 21, and 10).

6 Price of anarchy

In this section we quantify the POA in a traffic network as the ratio between the total latency, i.e., the total travel time over all drivers in different O-D pairs, obtained under Wardrop flows and that obtained under social-optimal flows. Assuming a network with multiple O-D pairs, the total latency of the network is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{(p,q)\in\mathscr{W}} \sum_{r\in\mathscr{R}_{pq}} x_r t_r(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{a\in\mathscr{A}} x_a t_a(x_a), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where x_r is the amount of flow on route r connecting nodes p and q and $t_r(\mathbf{x})$ is the total latency a vehicle experiences passing through route r, i.e.,

$$t_r(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{a \in r} t_a(x_a). \tag{16}$$

Let $\mathbf{x_r}$ be the vector of route flows for all O-D pairs with a length of $\sum_{(p,q)\in\mathscr{W}} |\mathscr{R}_{pq}|$. We will continue to use $\mathbf{x} = (x_a;\ a \in \mathscr{A})$ for the vector of flows through each link. Let now $\mathbf{x}_r^*$ and $\mathbf{x}_r^{ne}$ denote the socially optimum and the Wardrop route flow vectors respectively. Then, the POA is:

$$\text{POA} = \frac{L(\mathbf{x}_r^{ne})}{L(\mathbf{x}_r^*)}. \tag{17}$$

In order to find socially optimum flows we formulate the following optimization problem [15]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\mathbf{x_r}} \quad & \sum_{(p,q)\in\mathscr{W}} \sum_{r\in\mathscr{R}_{pq}} x_r t_r(\mathbf{x}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & t_r(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{a\in r} t_a(x_a), \quad \forall r \in \mathscr{R}_{pq}, \forall (p,q) \in \mathscr{W}, \\
& x_a = \sum_{(p,q)\in\mathscr{W}} \sum_{r\in\mathscr{R}_{pq}} x_r, \quad \forall a \in \mathscr{A}, \\
& \sum_{r\in\mathscr{R}_{pq}} x_r = d^{\mathbf{w}},\ \mathbf{w} = (p,q), \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathscr{W}, \\
& 0 \le x_a \le m_a, \quad \forall a \in \mathscr{A}.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The third constraint above is the set of flow conservation equality constraints for each O-D pair. The non-negativity and the capacity constraints for the flow on each link are imposed through the last constraint. The problem above is a Non-Linear Programming (NLP) problem in which the non-linearity comes from the cost function $t_a(x_a)$. Solving this NLP problem results in a socially optimal flow on each route for $\forall (p,q) \in \mathscr{W}$ and $r \in \mathscr{R}_{pq}$. Then, we may obtain the social optimal flows on each link, x_a^*, through the second constraint in (18).

Once we have socially optimum flows, we can calculate the POA by considering the link flow data derived from the speed and capacity datasets as the user-optimum flows, x_a^{ne}, $\forall a \in \mathscr{A}$. In particular, for each month and time period, first we calculate x_a^*'s using the corresponding O-D demand matrix and cost function, $t_a(\mathbf{x})$, derived from the speed and capacity datasets. Then, for a specific date and time period, we calculate the POA as follows:

$$\text{POA} = \frac{\sum_{a\in\mathscr{A}} x_a^{ne} t_a(x_a^{ne})}{\sum_{a\in\mathscr{A}} x_a^* t_a(x_a^*)}.$$

6.1 Numerical example

In this subsection, we investigate the POA for the network shown in Fig. 2(a). First, we consider a specific time period in a day during the year 2012 and use the corresponding cost function estimated by solving the QP (9). As discussed in Section 4.1, adopting Greenshield's traffic flow model, the Wardrop flow on each link has been calculated using speed and capacity datasets for each minute of a time period. Thus, in order to quantify the POA we calculate socially optimal flows by solving problem (18). As an example we calculate the POA for the PM (5 pm – 7 pm) period of Wednesday, Oct. 10, 2012. The corresponding O-D demand matrix includes 42 *active* O-D pairs with nonzero flow demands, applying to a total of 104 routes. Fig. 4 shows the socially optimum vs. average user-optimum flows on each link on Oct. 10 during the PM period. We can observe that for some links (e.g., links 5 and 11), there exist significant differences in the link flow values between selfish behavior and system-centric behavior suggesting several potential opportunities to improve the system performance. Adopting the estimated cost function corresponding to the PM period (refer to Fig. 3), we calculate the total cost using (15) under both routing behaviors. Tab. 2 shows the flow values on each link obtained under the socially optimal policy, x_a^*, as well as the average flow during the PM period extracted from data, x_a^{ne}, for Oct. 10. These flows result in the total latency of $2.003e4$ for the selfish driving vs. $1.704e4$ for the socially optimal routing which yields POA $= 1.1756$. We then look at the POA for a specific time period in a whole month. Fig. 5 shows the POA for the PM period during April 2012. It is observed that POA > 1 in several days in April during the PM period. In the worst case, on April 22, POA > 1.5, which means that the system is considerably inefficient under selfish driving. However, for a few days we also observe that POA < 1. This may

Table 2: Social-optimum vs Wardrop-equilibrium flows on each link of the subnetwork shown in Fig. 2.

edge No.	0	1	2	3	4	5
x_a^*	4.13e3	0.456e3	0	2.598e3	4.926e3	0.782e3
x_a^{ne}	1.922e3	1.364e3	1.96e3	2.519e3	5.393e3	3.736e3
edge No.	6	7	8	9	10	11
x_a^*	2.202e3	2.519e3	6.283e3	7.64e3	3.478e3	0
x_a^{ne}	1.967e3	3.065e3	6.085e3	6.251e3	5.0128e3	3.749e3
edge No.	12	13	14	15	16	17
x_a^*	1.425e3	3.46e3	3.135e3	2.518e3	0.857e3	0.995e3
x_a^{ne}	1.267e3	3.486e3	3.624e3	3.515e3	1.471e3	0.35e3
edge No.	18	19	20	21	22	23
x_a^*	3.152e3	7.825e3	3.122e3	1.934e3	1.109e3	2.212e3
x_a^{ne}	3.277e3	5.77e3	5.298e3	3.925e3	1.53e3	2.651e3

happen since we use the *average* O-D demand matrix for all weekdays (weekend / holidays), find social optimum flows by solving the optimization problem (18), and force route flows to meet the average O-D demand. However, for a specific day in a month the *exact* O-D demand matrix may not be equal to the average one, thus, the user-optimum flows do not need to meet the flow conservation constraints in (18) and may result in a smaller objective value.

We note that our POA estimation ignores the (potentially critical) distinction between a link being "congested" vs. "un-congested" [16]. Thus, our future research will focus on including this aspect along with analyzing a larger subnetwork and applying O-D demand matrices and cost functions on a daily basis.

As an alternative way of quantifying the POA, we also assume a scenario in which all drivers use socially optimum routing and a single driver acts selfishly. In this scenario, we assume the user has prior knowledge about the total delay on each path of the desired O-D pair. The selfish driver deviates from the social optimum flow by traveling through the *shortest path*, thus, enjoying less traveling time. In our example, under the social optimum policy, the latency a driver experiences over each link is shown in Tab. 3. Now, a driver joining the flow of O-D pair 1-6, can choose one of the four paths from node 1 to node 6 (refer to Fig. 2(b)): $\text{Path}_1 : 1 \to 3 \to 6$; $\text{Path}_2 : 1 \to 2 \to 3 \to 6$; $\text{Path}_3 : 1 \to 3 \to 5 \to 6$ and $\text{Path}_4 : 1 \to 2 \to 3 \to 5 \to 6$ with traveling times 0.654, 0.651, 0.872, and 0.869 hr respectively. If the driver acts selfishly and joins the shortest path, path_2, instead of her assigned path, path_4, she will gain 25.08% in traveling time.

Table 3: Traveling time (hr) on each link under system-optimal flows.

edge No.	0	1	2	3	4	5
t_a^*	0.310	0.329	0.455	0.465	0.143	0.169
edge No.	6	7	8	9	10	11
t_a^*	0.533	0.551	0.242	0.252	0.199	0.205
edge No.	12	13	14	15	16	17
t_a^*	0.239	0.247	0.175	0.173	0.343	0.344
edge No.	18	19	20	21	22	23
t_a^*	0.19	0.19	0.26	0.26	0.194	0.201

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we study a large-scale transportation network (Eastern Massachusetts) using vehicle probe data obtained from the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the year 2012, and obtain estimates for the cost functions determining users' route choices. We derive sensitivity analysis results and quantify the Price of Anarchy (POA). Our findings could help elucidate the underlying operation of a large transportation system and provide useful suggestions to the efforts of building a smarter city.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Boston Region MPO, and Scott Peterson in particular, for supplying the data and providing us invaluable clarifications throughout our work. We also thank Vishal Gupta for helpful discussions in using the code [17].

References

[1] X. Wang, N. Xiao, L. Xie, E. Frazzoli, and D. Rus, "Analysis of price of anarchy in traffic networks with heterogeneous price-sensitivity populations," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 2227 – 2237, 2015.

[2] H. Youn, M. T. Gastner, and H. Jeong, "Price of anarchy in transportation networks: Efficiency and optimality control," *Physical review letters*, vol. 101, no. 12, pp. 128 701/1–128 701/4, 2008.

[3] S. C. Dafermos and F. T. Sparrow, "The traffic assignment problem for a general network," *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards B*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 91–118, 1969.

[4] P. Patriksson, *The traffic assignment problem: models and methods*. Dover Books on Mathematics, 2015.

[5] D. Bertsimas, V. Gupta, and I. C. Paschalidis, "Data-driven estimation in equilibrium using inverse optimization," *Mathematical Programming*, pp. 1–39, 2014.

[6] D. Branston, "Link capacity functions: A review," *Transportation Research*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 223–236, 1976.

[7] C. P. Simon and L. Blume, *Mathematics for economists*. Norton New York, 1994, vol. 7.

[8] T. Evgeniou, M. Pontil, and T. Poggio, "Regularization networks and support vector machines," *Advances in computational mathematics*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–50, 2000.

[9] T. Mathew, "Traffic stream models," *http://nptel.ac.in/courses/105101008/downloads/cete_03.pdf*, 2014.

[10] M. L. Hazelton, "Estimation of origin–destination matrices from link flows on uncongested networks," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 549–566, 2000.

[11] J. Zhang, "O-D Pair Labels," *https://github.com/jingzbu/InverseVIsTraffic/blob/master/temp_files/O-D_pair_labels.txt*, 2015.

[12] ——, "Route-Link Incidence Matrix," *https://github.com/jingzbu/InverseVIsTraffic/blob/master/temp_files/path-link_incidence.txt*, 2015.

[13] ——, "O-D Demand Matrix," *https://github.com/jingzbu/InverseVIsTraffic/blob/master/temp_files/*, 2015.

[14] ——, "3-fold Cross-Validation," *https://github.com/jingzbu/InverseVIsTraffic/tree/master/cross_validation_uni-class*, 2015.

[15] S. Pourazarm, C. G. Cassandras, and T. Wang, "Optimal routing and charging of energy-limited vehicles in traffic networks," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1325–1350, 2016.

[16] L. Immers and S. Logghe, "Traffic flow theory," Course notes. Department of Civil Engineering, Catholic Univ. Leuven, 2002.

[17] V. Gupta, "InverseVIs (Contains all code from paper: 'Data-Driven Estimation in Equilibrium: An Inverse Variational Inequality Approach')," *https://github.com/vgupta1/InverseVIs*, 2014.



(a)



(b)

Figure 4: (a) Social-opt. (green) and user-opt. (red) flows on links 0 to 11; (b) Social-opt. (green) and user-opt. (red) flows on links 12 to 23.



Figure 5: POA for PM period (5–7 pm) in April based on avg. flow on each link.